

# Monthly Status Reporting

## Revision Working Team

### Meeting Minutes

**DAY:** 11/28/06  
**TIME:** 1:00pm – 2:00pm  
**LOCATION:** 3900 Conference Room 39A

<b>Meeting Called By:</b>	Gaye Mays		
<b>Meeting Purpose:</b>	Discuss project status indicator settings & alerts		
<b>Attendees:</b> Unable to attend: Steve Tedder, Greg Jones	Gaye Mays – EPMO Steve Tedder - EPMO David Butts - Wildlife Resources Commission	Bob Giannuzzi - EPMO Barbara Swartz – Strategic Initiatives Richard McGee – EPMO/QA	Greg Jones – Crime Control Lucy Cornelius – DHHS Manny Zech – DOT Jim Tulenko- Strategic Initiatives
<b>Meeting Documents:</b>	PPM Project Status Indicator Settings Guidelines (Jelly Bean chart)		
<b>Attachments:</b>	DHHS QA Feedback Document		
<b>Next Meeting:</b>	12/12/06 @ 1:00pm		

### Discussion Points

1	<p><b>PPM Project Status Settings Guidelines (Jelly Beans):</b>  Lucy Cornelius drafted the attached feedback document which we review as a team. Much discussion occurred on each of the items:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Why are cost variances tracked per phase and variances hour tracked for the project as well as assessed based on different criteria? Makes it more difficult to complete root cause analysis because tracking of “apples and oranges; not apples and apples”.</li> <li>2. Under utilization of resources can either be a good thing or a bad thing, but projects receive a yellow jellybean even if it is a good thing.</li> <li>3. At times project costs that are below budget indicate problems. How is this assessed?</li> <li>4. Consider changing criteria for sending letters as previously discussed.</li> <li>5. Provide PMs with more training about what should be placed in the milestones section of PPM tool.</li> <li>6. No consistent place for action plans – sometimes they are contained within jellybean comments; sometimes noted in an issue.</li> <li>7. The triple constraints don’t appear to be accessed in relationship to one another (also related to #1)</li> </ol> <p><b>Item#1</b> Richard McGee advised the State CIO requires costs/variances be tracked by phase rather than by total project. Jim Tulenko also advised that the State Budget Office requires approval and cost tracking by phase in order to better control the total cost of projects.</p> <p><b>Item # 2</b> The group was in general agreement with this statement; however it should be recognized within each agency, if the project is on track overall, this is not necessarily a cause for concern.</p> <p><b>Item #3</b> The group was in agreement that the EPMO should consider setting a parameter to flag projects under budget by 10% as yellow and 15% as red. This should result in excess project funds being returned to the state.</p> <p><b>Item #4</b> This change has already been implemented. An overall yellow status will result in requiring a meeting with the Project Manager, PMA, EPMO Director and EPMO QA to review and develop an action plan.</p> <p><b>Item#5</b> The team was in agreement that training on how to define meaningful milestones is necessary. Richard McGee advised that he viewed milestone parameters per three guidelines 1) Due at a specific point in time 2) Defined as a “key deliverable 3) Go/No Go decision points i.e. gate reviews</p> <p><b>Item#6</b> The team was in agreement that the tool does allow corrective actions to be documented in various areas. A</p>
---	--

	<p>suggestion was made to add an issue in the tool referencing the most current issue log showing problem resolutions and attach the log in document management. This would provide additional information to the QA team and provide a single point of reference .Lucy noted that actions plans may take several months to implement and this should be noted in the tool so it does not appear that the issue in question is outstanding or not being addressed in a timely manner. It was also suggested that if the agency is compiling an internal status report, it may be helpful to attach this in the tool as well. Any additional information that the agency can provide to the QA group would be helpful in fostering a better understanding of the project.</p> <p><b>Item #7</b> This could be addressed by requiring an “earned value” type of analysis each month.</p> <p><b>Resource Tracking:</b> Jim Tulenko provided a brief overview of how the current PPM tool could track resource planning &amp; utilization. We will investigate this further in future meetings.</p>
2	<p><b>“Top 10” problems/issues identified with current process:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Difficulties with using the PPM tool/overall inflexibility</li> <li>2. Tool should measure triple constraints (scope, cost, schedule) but currently does not measure these accurately</li> <li>3. Project schedule measurement is “time consumption” rather than an “earned value” type metric</li> <li>4. Under utilization of resources is viewed as a negative</li> <li>5. Need to more clearly define milestones to make them more meaningful</li> <li>6. PPM tool does not accommodate the conceptual phase of a project, thus when the project meets the criteria to be input into the tool, the level of detail required may be difficult to capture and the PM must complete a number of “catch up” status reports</li> <li>7. PPM tool does not accommodate other development methodologies such as “Agile”</li> <li>8. Cannot see appropriate detail in current tool status report i.e. detail on issues and risks</li> <li>9. Limited capacity for comments and ability to reference historical information</li> <li>10. Resource management is not integrated into UMT tool. Difficult to accurately reconcile time for all resources.</li> </ol>
3	<p><b>Project Approach &amp; Updates:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Define audience for monthly status reports –<i>representative agencies have defined the audience status reports are prepared for in their agency; the PPM tool status report is primarily used by the EPMO QA group</i></li> <li>• Define elements that should be included in status reports</li> <li>• Define/evaluate status codes (red, green, yellow, etc.) and alerts – <i>in progress</i></li> <li>• Collect example reports already in use – <i>in progress</i></li> <li>• Formulate recommendations – identify “quick wins” and long term requirements</li> </ul>

## Action Item Updates

1	Validate audience for EPMO monthly status reports – Gaye will discuss with Sharon Hayes – <i>11/15 Sharon advised that the current monthly status reporting process is designed to provide project information to facilitate the QA process.</i>
2	Draft suggested changes to “jelly bean” parameters – Steve Tedder & Lucy Cornelius – <i>11/28 Lucy completed DHHS feedback</i>
3	Evaluate PPM resource tracking functionality – TEAM ( <i>We may want to have some PM’s try in test system</i> )